

Amendment dated June 15, 2005
Response to Office Action dated 03/15/05

Application No 09/868,669

REMARKS

Claims 1-17, 19, and 21 are pending with the response. Claims 1-17 and 19 stand rejected by this Office Action. The Applicants canceled claim 18 in a previous paper and are canceling claim 20 in this paper. The Applicants are amending claims 1, 9, 10, and 17. The Applicants are adding claim 21.

The Office Action acknowledges the preliminary amendment to amend the title to "A Goal Based System Utilizing a Spreadsheet and Table Based Architecture" and the IIS filed on May 4, 2004.

New Claim

The Applicants are adding claim 21, which are supported by the specification as originally filed, e.g., page 9, lines 12-14.

Priority

The Office Action acknowledges Applicant's claim for priority based on US Application No. 09/218,726 filed on December 22, 1998.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 1-17 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,727,161 (Purcell) in view of W.I.P.O. International Publication No. WO 97/44766 A1 (Cook) and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,788,504 (Rice)

Regarding claim 1, the Applicants are amending the claim to include the feature of "managing information flow utilizing a table of components, each component encapsulating a behavior characteristic and data to support an associated set of services through a published

Amendment dated June 15, 2005
Response to Office Action dated 03/15/05

Application No 09/868,669

interface." The amendment is supported by the specification as originally filed. For example, the present patent application discloses (Page 9, lines 12-14.):

A Component can be thought of as a black box that encapsulates the behavior and data necessary to support a related set of services. It exposes these services to the outside world through published interfaces. The published interface of a component allows you to understand what it does through the services it offers, but not how it does it.

The Office Action alleges that Purcell teaches "managing information flow utilizing a table of components (column 11, lines 55-65, 'Each spreadsheet ... numbers of cells')". (Page 3.) However, Purcell fails to teach the feature of "managing information flow utilizing a table of components, each component encapsulating a behavior characteristic and data to support an associated set of services through a published interface." (Emphasis added.) Purcell merely uses a worksheet for a component of analysis. Moreover, Rice and Cook do not remedy the deficiencies of Purcell.

Similarly, the Applicant has amended claim 10 to include "logic that manages information flow utilizing a table of components, each component encapsulating a behavior characteristic and data to support an associated set of services through a published interface." Moreover, claims 2-9 ultimately depend from claim 1, and claims 11-17 and 19 ultimately depend from claim 10 and are patentable for at least the above reasons. The Applicants are canceling claim 20 without prejudice. The Applicants request reconsideration of claims 1-17 and 19.

In addition to the discussion above, regarding claim 2, the Office Action further alleges that (Page 25.):

Claim 2's further limitations are taught in Cook et al: the step of instantiating a component from the table of components to measure progress toward the goal based on the presentation model (page 20, lines 15-23, "Teachers and administrators ... even one student")

Amendment dated June 15, 2005
Response to Office Action dated 03/15/05

Application No. 09/868,669

However, Cook fails to even suggest the feature of "instantiating a component from the table of components to **measure progress** toward the goal based on the presentation model." (Emphasis added.) Cook merely discloses creating instance of materials without measuring progress toward the goal. Similarly, claim 11 includes "logic that instantiates a component from the table of components to **measure progress** toward the goal based on the presentation model" and is thus patentable for at least the above reasons.

Regarding claim 3, the Office Action further alleges (Page 5):

Claim 3's further limitations are taught in Cook et al: the step of instantiating a component from the table of components to interrupt and interview a student to obtain information to **measure progress** toward the goal and determine appropriate feedback based on the presentation model (page 20, lines 4-12, "the student can ... or remediation materials").

However, as discussed above, Cook fails to even suggest the feature of "instantiating a component from the table of components to interrupt and interview a student to obtain information to **measure progress** toward the goal and determine appropriate feedback based on the presentation model." (Emphasis added.) Similarly, claim 12 includes "logic that instantiates a component from the table of components to interrupt and interview a student to obtain information to **measure progress** toward the goal and determine appropriate feedback based on the presentation model."

Regarding claim 7, the Office Action further alleges that (Page 7.):

Claim 7's further limitations are taught in Cook et al "instantiating a component from the table of components to interact with a quantitative analysis model to perform what-if analysis based on the presentation model (page 124, lines 2-12, "These named display ... to generate displays")

However, Cook fails to even suggest the feature of "instantiating a component from the table of components to interact with a quantitative analysis model to perform **what-if analysis** based on the presentation model." (Emphasis added.) Cook merely discloses a branching display that is dependent on student reactions to the display but fails to disclose a quantitative analysis model to

Amendment dated June 15, 2005
Response to Office Action dated 03/15/05

Application No 09/868,669

perform what-if analysis. Similarly, claim 16 includes "logic that instantiates a component from the table of components to interact with a quantitative analysis model to perform what if analysis based on the presentation model."

Regarding claim 9, the Applicants are amending claim 9 to include the feature of "receiving a selected action, from the student, for each time period of the time based simulation." (Emphasis added.) The amendment is supported by the specification as originally filed (e.g., the table on page 41, entry "Run a company task" in which "each period the student selects from a pre-determined list of actions to take."). The Office Action alleges that (Page 7 - page 8.):

Claim 9's further limitations are taught in Cook et al: instantiating a component from the table of components to present a time based simulation based on the presentation model (page 24, lines 7-25, "The corresponding event ... the time elapsed", page 109, Table 3; page 124, lines 2-12, "These named display ... to generate displays")

Cook merely discloses an expected time to complete a topic but fails to suggest "receiving a selected action, from the student, for each time period of the timed based simulation." Similarly, claim 17 includes "logic that receives, from the student, a selected action for each time period of the time based simulation."

Amendment dated June 15, 2005
Response to Office Action dated 03/15/05

Application No 09/868,669

CONCLUSION

All objections and rejections have been addressed. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 15, 2005



Kenneth F. Smolik
Registration No. 44,344
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606-7407
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Facsimile: 312-463-5000